

Official

- 5 -

REMARKS


The Office action of August 2, 2007, has been carefully considered and reconsideration of the amended application is earnestly solicited.

The amendments in the specification and in Claim 7 are intended to correct a few minor errors. The amendments of Claims 1 and 5 are believed to remove both the 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103, as well as 35 USC § 112 objections of the Office action.

The amendments of claims 1 and 5 overcome the rejections based on 35 USC § 102 by clearly distinguishing the features and mode of operation of our discharge and collector electrodes from anything suggested by the cited prior art. The amended basic claims are therefore not anticipated by Zaromb et al., and neither are any of the subsidiary claims.

As to the obviousness rejections based on 35 USC § 103, it is noted that they are not only overcome by the amendments in the basic claims but that the teachings of Zaromb et al are not really relevant to the present claims 2-5, 7 and 8. The aerosol of Zaromb et al., Column 12, Lines 16-20, serves mainly to preconcentrate traces of an analyte prior to its entry into the collector, whereas the mist formed by our ultrasonic humidifier serves mainly to wet the inner walls of the collector electrode. Also, as to claims 4 and 8, Boucher's cited teachings, Column 1, Lines 55-65, do not deal with removal of particles adhering to any walls. In any case, once the rejections are overcome for claims 1 and 5, they should be overcome a fortiori in all the subsidiary claims.

Respectfully submitted by,


Solomon Zaromb
Registration No. 28,571
9S 706 William Dr.
Burr Ridge, IL 60527
Telephone: 630/654-2109
Fax: 630/986-8764

Official

- 6 -

CERTIFICATION OF FAXING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this response is about to be transmitted to fax number 571-273-8300 on or about October 18, 2007.


Solomon Zaromb